

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/826,676	04/05/2001	Jin-Wen Tzeng	P-1026	3516	
7	590 08/14/2003				
James R. Cartiglia			EXAMINER		
Graftech Inc. BRANDYWINE WEST 1521 CONCORD PIKE, SUITE 301			OWENS, DOUGLAS W		
WILMINGTON, DE 19803		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2811		
			DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003	DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			- Ym
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	•
Advisory Action	09/826,676	TZENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas W Owens	2811	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper relich places the application	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	·		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on SIX MONTHS OF THE STEED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended from: (1) the expiration date of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canc	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejo			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does N	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLEL	Y to issues which w	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	S:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exar	minėr.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	1 200	[Nomes	
	TOM THOM	MAS	
	SUPERVISORY PATEN TECHNOLOGY CEI	IT EXAMINER	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not convincing. The Applicant argues that the cited references are only drawn to adhesive coating as opposed to the protective coating of the claimed invention. This argument is not convincing since Ingraham et al. teaches a protective coating that is identical to the material claimed in the instant application. Additinally, Shane et al. teaches that protective coatings may be applied to the GRAFOIL, in addition to the adhesive coatings (See Col. 14, lines 31 - 35, for example). Coatings applied for the purpose of adding reflectivity, additional strength and particularly wear and oxidation resitance are indeed protective coatings that would have been sufficient to prevent flaking.